

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
GALVESTON DIVISION

DAVID A. WILLIAMSON §
§
VS. § CIVIL ACTION NO. G-03-990
§
THALES GEOSOLUTIONS, INC., ET AL. §

OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court is a Report and Recommendation from the United States Magistrate Judge which, *inter alia*, recommends the denial of the Motion of Plaintiff, David A. Williamson, seeking to reopen this case which was settled by Williamson on February 2, 2005. Despite a February 9, 2007, deadline, Williamson has filed no objections to the recommendation.

This Court, after *de novo* review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), finds that the Report and Recommendation is a well reasoned and proper analysis of the facts surrounding the settlement of this litigation and it is, therefore, **ACCEPTED** by this Court in its entirety and incorporated by reference herein.

It is, therefore, the **ORDER** of this Court that the converted “Motion for Relief from Judgment” (Instrument no. 40) of Plaintiff, David A. Williamson, is **DENIED**.

This Court also agrees with the Magistrate Judge that Williamson’s efforts to reopen this case were vexatious and that R. Edward Blanchard, the attorney for Defendant, **SHALL** recover his resultant expenses.

It is, therefore, the further **ORDER** of this Court that David A. Williamson **SHALL** pay to R. Edward Blanchard the sum of **\$402.54** to reimburse Blanchard for the expenses he incurred for attending the Hearing on Williamson’s meritless Motion.

Finally, the Court also agrees with the Magistrate Judge that this is not the proper forum for declaring Williamson's wife, Karen Williamson, a vexatious litigator under Chapter 11 of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code and, therefore, the Motion (Instrument no. 42) of Williamson's former attorney, Thomas J. Mosele, to do so is respectfully **DENIED**.

DONE at Galveston, Texas, this 2nd day of March, 2007.



Samuel B. Kent
United States District Judge